

1 BRYAN J. SINCLAIR (SBN 205885)
Email: bryan.sinclair@bipc.com
2 KARINEH KHACHATOURIAN (SBN 202634)
Email: karineh.khachatourian@bipc.com
3 BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY LLP
333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 700
4 Redwood Shores, California 94065-1418
Telephone: (650) 622-2300
5 Facsimile: (650) 622-2499

6 GEORGE GOTTLIEB (ADMITTED *PRO HAC VICE*)
Email: ggottlieb@grr.com
7 MARC P. MISTHAL (ADMITTED *PRO HAC VICE*)
Email: mmisthal@grr.com
8 GOTTLIEB RACKMAN & REISMAN, P.C.
270 Madison Avenue
9 New York, NY 10016-0601
Telephone: (212) 684-3900
10 Facsimile: (212) 684-3999

11 Attorneys for Plaintiff,
KNOLL, INC.

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 KNOLL, INC., a Delaware corporation,

16 Plaintiff,

17 vs.

18 DANRICK COMMERCE GROUP, LLC a/k/a
MODERNCOLLECTIONS.COM, DANNY
19 LOUIE, and DOES A-Z, Retailers for
Alphaville Design, Inc.,

20 Defendants.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Case No. 08-CV-0778-MHP

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE
REQUEST TO CONSIDER WHETHER
CASES SHOULD BE RELATED**

[Civil L.R. 3-12 and 7-11]

Judge: Honorable Marilyn H. Patel

Complaint filed: February 1, 2008

Trial date: None Set

1 Having considered Plaintiff Knoll, Inc.'s ("Knoll") Administrative Motion to Consider
 2 Whether Cases Should be Related ("Motion") pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-12, and good cause
 3 appearing therefore,

4 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the case entitled *Alphaville Design, Inc. v. Knoll, Inc.*,
 5 Case No. 07-CV-05569-MHP ("Alphaville Action"), is deemed related to the case entitled *Knoll,*
 6 *Inc. v. Danrick Commerce Group, LLC, et al.*, Case No. 08-CV-0778-MHP ("Danrick Action") as
 7 defined by Civil L.R. 3-12, and should be consolidated and calendared on the same track. The
 8 Court finds that both actions concern the same parties, trademarks, and causes of action under the
 9 Lanham Act. Specifically, the parties' respective claims and counterclaims asserted in the
 10 Alphaville and Danrick Actions all relate to the same series of transactions and occurrences and
 11 present common questions of law. The Court further finds that if the cases are not deemed related,
 12 it would appear likely that there would be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense.

13 The case management schedule and conference in the Alphaville Action is **HEREBY**
 14 **VACATED**. The Court shall utilize the dates set in the case management order in the Danrick
 15 Action for both cases to ensure that all parties are served with the complaint and summons and can
 16 all participate in the ADR, Rule 26(f) and case management conferences as the same time. This
 17 schedule shall be follows:

18 4/21/2008 *Last day to:

- 19 • meet and confer re: initial disclosures, early FRCivP 26(f) &
 20 settlement, ADR process selection, and ADR L.R. 3.5
 21 • file Joint ADR Certification with Stipulation to Civil L.R. 16-8
 22 ADR Process or Notice of Need for ADR Phone
 Conference

23 5/5/2008 *Last day to file Rule 26(f) Report, complete initial FRCivP 26(a) (1)
 24 disclosures or state objection in Rule 26(f) Report and Civil L.R. 16-9
 25 file Case Management Statement per attached Standing
 Order re Contents of Joint Case Management Statement
 (also available at <http://www.cand.uscourts.gov>)

26 5/12/2008 INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE Civil L.R. 16-10
 27 (CMC) in Ctrm 15, 18th Floor, SF at 4:00 PM

* If the Initial Case Management Conference is continued, the other deadlines are continued accordingly.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____, 2008

THE MARILYN H. PATEL
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT